REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 is currently pending. Claims 2- 28 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Support for the changes is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 32-33.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 23-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,744 to Akiwumi-Assani et al. ("Assani") and U.S. Patent No. 5,724,537 to Jones ("Jones").

Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Assani and Jones in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,510,842 to Phillips et al. ("Phillips").

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 16-17, 23-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over EP 0720372 to Kwon (hereinafter, merely "Kwon") in view of Jones.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 14-17, 19-21, 23-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones.

Claim 4 was rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones and further in view of Assani.

Claim 9 was rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 715,354 to Iwamura et al. (hereinafter, merely "Iwamura").

Claim 10 was rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones and further in view of Iwamura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 959, 690 to Toebes, VIII et al. (hereinafter, merely "Toebes").

Claim 11 was rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones and further in view of Iwamura and further in view of Toebes and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 201, 927 to Comer (hereinafter, merely "Comer").

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Phillips in view of Jones and further in view of Iwamura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 341, 193 to Schipper et al. (hereinafter, merely "Schipper").

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

"A decoding device for decoding a coded stream, the device comprising ...

an inverse DCT circuit for inversing DCT on the decoded coefficient data,

As amended, claim 1 describes that each slice decoder includes an inverse DCT circuit. The inverse DCT circuit inverses DCT on the decoded coefficient data. Applicants submit that the art used as a basis of rejection fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest the above identified feature of claim 1.

Therefore, for all the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP Attorneys for Applicants

Thomas F. Presson

Reg. No. 41,442 (212) 588-0800